



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,326	12/12/2003	Stadjana Petrovic	38898-0059	9081
23577	7590	09/04/2008		
RIDOUT & MAYBEE LLP 225 KING STREET WEST 10TH FLOOR TORONTO, ON M5V 3M2 CANADA			EXAMINER JOHNSON, CARLTON	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,326

Applicant(s)

PETROVIC, SLADJANA

Examiner

CARLTON V. JOHNSON

Art Unit

2136

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-16, 18-26 and 28-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-16, 18-26, 28-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/2008 has been entered.

2. This action is responding to application papers filed 12-23-2003. Claims **1 - 4, 6 - 16, 18 - 26, 28 - 34** are pending. Claims **1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32** have been amended. Claims **5, 17, 27** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 13, 23** are independent.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/29/2008 have been fully considered and are partially persuasive. A new ground of rejection has been entered.

3.1 Applicant argues for claims 1, 13, 23, the direct transfer of a session ID and timestamp parameters indicating session state information between two network-connected systems. (see Remarks Pages 8-14)

The Wood prior art discloses redirection methods for the transmission of a designated session token between servers without storage of the session token at the

browser. (see Woods paragraph [0050], lines 12-17; paragraph [0051], lines 13-16)

The Woods prior art discloses the direct transfer of session state parameters such as a session ID parameter and a time/date parameter between network-connected entities. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: some parameters can be passed directly) And, the Lennon prior art discloses the direct transfer of session state information consisting of a session ID and additional session state information such as a time/date parameter between servers. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session state information) between two servers)

3.2 Applicant argues the obviousness rejection. (see Remarks Pages 8, 9)

Each obviousness combination indicates the claim limitation(s) the combined prior art references teach. In addition, a cited passage from the referenced prior art indicates the motivation for the obviousness combination. Each obviousness combination's disclosure is equivalent to the Applicant's claimed limitation(s) for the claimed invention.

It is not a requirement that the referenced prior art solve the same problem as claimed invention in order to be combinable. There are three criteria for combination: (1) same field of endeavor (which is session management); (2) motivation for the combination (stated in Office Action); and (3) successful disclosure of claim limitation due to prior art combination. All three criteria are satisfied by the Office Action. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 1-4; paragraph [0036], lines 1-2; see Woods paragraph

[0047], lines 6-14; paragraph [0057], lines 21-24; see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67:
same field of endeavor: session management)

3.3 The Williams prior art invention discloses a database for the storage of session management information. (see Williams paragraph [0037], lines 10-12; paragraph [0075], lines 12-16: database, storage). In addition, the Williams prior art discloses the capability to redirect service requests from one server to another server for service completion. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session token and session information, redirection request for resources)

The Williams prior art discloses a system for secure session management within a collection of web server systems (web farm) using a session token. The claim limitations disclose that the token is renewed after each use. (see Specification Page 2, Paragraph [0006], lines 7-9) In the Williams prior art a session management web service updates the session token with each received request. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-13; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: generate new encrypted session token and transfer) In addition, the Williams prior art discloses the capability to encrypt and decrypt the designated session token.

The Williams and Woods prior art combination discloses that if the request must be redirected to a different server where the requested resource is located (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session token and session information, redirection request for resources) then the decrypted session token is transmitted to the new server (see Wood paragraph [0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3:

session token with redirection request) and the session management web service generates a new session token to be used in place of the previous session token. The new session token is transmitted with the requested web resource.

The Williams prior art discloses that the server is utilized for authentication and session token(s) generation. Also, the Williams prior art discloses the capability for session tokens to be encrypted and decrypted during session token processing. (see Williams paragraph [0051], lines 14-16: encryption/decryption utilized for security) Once client access procedures are completed, the Williams prior art processes service requests to access a required resource.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **1 - 6, 9 - 18, 21 - 28, 31 - 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Williams et al.** (US PGPUb No. **20030005118**) in view of **Wood et al.** (US PGPUb No. **20040210771**) and further in view of **Lennon et al.** (US Patent No. **7,099,946**).

With Regards to Claims 1, 23, Williams discloses a method, computer program

product of secure session management for a web farm, the web farm including a first server and a second server, the second server having a requested web page, the method comprising:

- a) receiving, at the first server, a request for the requested web page from a browser, said request including an encrypted session token associated with a session; (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: session management (associated with a session); paragraph [0019], lines 1-5: request processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: session token; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16; paragraph [0051], lines 14-16: encryption utilized for security; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: program product)
- b) decrypting said encrypted session token at the first server to obtain a session information; (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: validate (must decryption required to process encrypted information) session information, process encrypted session information; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: program product)
- d) verifying said session. (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11; paragraph [0074], lines 7-11: validate session token information, client and session identification information; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: program product)

Williams discloses wherein redirecting said request to the second server. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session information) Williams does not specifically disclose including the transmission of said session token to the second server in a redirect request.

However, Wood discloses:

- c) including transmitting said session token to the second server; (see Wood paragraph [0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for transmitting a session token and session state information to a second server as taught by Wood. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Wood in order to enable the capability to upgrade session credentials and maintain session continuity. (see Wood paragraph [0016], lines 11-16: “ ... *The session upgrading means upgrading the session by obtaining and authenticating a second credential to allow access to the target information resource if the first authenticated credential is inconsistent with the trust level requirement. The session upgrade means maintains session continuity across credential upgrades. ...* ”)

Williams-Woods does not specifically disclose direct transmission of a session ID and additional session state information such as a time/date parameter between two systems. However, Lennon discloses for a); b): wherein including transmitting said session ID and timestamp directly to the second server. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier (directly) from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session state information) between two servers)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to directly transmit a session ID and timestamp (session state information) to a second server as taught by Lennon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lennon in order to save time and greatly reduce aggregation due to customer not having to use a different search engine interface for searching each content provider. (see Lennon col. 1, line 67 - col. 2, line 7: “ ... *If the potential customer wanted to perform a search across several different content providers/distributors, the potential customer would have to visit the Web site and use the search engine of each of the different content providers/distributors. Such actions are often time consuming and annoying because the potential customer must use a different search engine interface each time. ...* ”)

With Regards to Claims 2, 24, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 23, further including creating a new session token, encrypting said new session token at the second server to produce a new encrypted session token, and transmitting a response to said browser from the second server, wherein said response includes said new encrypted session token. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-13; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: generate new encrypted session token and transfer; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 3, 5, 15, 17, 25, 27, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 2, 13, 14, 23, 24, wherein said creating a new session token includes generating a new session ID and updating said timestamp. (see Williams paragraph [0062], lines 9-16; paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: session token, session ID and timestamp; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 4, 16, 26, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 2, 14, 24, further including a step of updating a common session database by replacing said session information with said new session token in said common session database. (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

And, Lennon discloses wherein including transmitting said session ID and timestamp directly to the second server. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session information) between two servers)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to transmit said session ID and timestamp (session state information) directly to the second system as taught by Lennon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lennon in order to save time and greatly reduce

aggregation due to customer not having to use a different search engine interface for searching each content provider. (see Lennon col. 1, line 67 - col. 2, line 7)

With Regards to Claims 6, 18, 28, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 17, 23, wherein a common session database contains a stored session ID and a stored timestamp, and wherein said verifying includes comparing said session ID and said timestamp with said stored session ID and said stored timestamp. (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage; paragraph [0062], lines 9-16; paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: session token, session ID and timestamp; paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: verification session information paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 9, 21, 31, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 13, 23, wherein said step of transmitting includes incorporating said session information into a URL. (see Williams paragraph [0044], lines 8-12: URL processing techniques utilized paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

And, Lennon discloses wherein includes incorporating said session ID and timestamp into a URL. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and

additional session information) between two servers)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to transmit said session ID and timestamp (session state information) directly to the second server as taught by Lennon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lennon in order to save time and greatly reduce aggregation due to customer not having to use a different search engine interface for searching each content provider. (see Lennon col. 1, line 67 - col. 2, line 7)

With Regards to Claims 10, 32, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 23, wherein a session management web service performs said step of verifying, said session management web service being accessible to said first server and said second server, and wherein said verifying includes comparing said session information with stored session data. (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: session information verification paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

And, Lennon discloses wherein includes transferring said session ID and timestamp between systems for comparison. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session information) between two servers)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to transmit said session ID and timestamp (session state information) directly to the

second server as taught by Lennon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lennon in order to save time and greatly reduce aggregation due to customer not having to use a different search engine interface for searching each content provider. (see Lennon col. 1, line 67 - col. 2, line 7)

With Regards to Claims 11, 33, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 10, 32, wherein the web farm further includes a common session database containing said stored session data. (see Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9; paragraph [0036], lines 3-4: web farms, set of interconnected web servers paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 12, 22, 34, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 13, 23, wherein said requested web page includes a web resource selected from the group including an applet, an HTML page, a Java server page, and an Active server page. (see Williams paragraph [0044], lines 3-8; paragraph [0042], lines 8-15: protected resource, a HTML web page paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claim 13, Williams discloses a system for secure session management, the system being coupled to a network and receiving a request for a requested web page from a browser via the network, the request including an encrypted session token, the system comprising:

- b) a second server including the requested web page; (see Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9: multiple servers; paragraph [0044], lines 3-8; paragraph [0042], lines 8-15: resource requested, a HTML web page)
- c) a common session database including stored session data; (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage)

Also, Williams discloses:

- a) a first server including a first request handler for receiving the request and decrypting the encrypted session token to produce a session information. (see Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16: multiple servers, encrypted; paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: validate (i.e. must decrypt in order to process) session information)
- d) a session management web service, accessible to said first server and said second server and including a validation component for comparing said session token with said stored session data; (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: session verification information)

Williams discloses wherein said first request handler adapted to redirect the request to said second server. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection capabilities) Williams does not specifically disclose the transfer of session state information between two servers.

However, Wood discloses:

- e) transmit the session information to said second server. (see Wood paragraph

[0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request; paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: direct transfer of parameters between two systems)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to enable the capability for including transmitting said session token to the second server as taught by Wood. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Wood in order to enable the capability to upgrade session credentials and maintain session continuity. (see Wood paragraph [0016], lines 11-16)

And, Lennon discloses wherein includes transmitting said session ID and timestamp between systems. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session information) between two servers)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to transmit said session ID and timestamp directly to the second server as taught by Lennon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lennon in order to save time and greatly reduce aggregation due to customer not having to use a different search engine interface for searching each content provider. (see Lennon col. 1, line 67 - col. 2, line 7)

With Regards to Claim 14, Williams discloses the system claimed in claim 13, wherein

said session management web service includes a token generator for creating a new session token for said second server, and wherein said second server includes a second request handler, said second request handler encrypting said new session token to produce a new encrypted session token and transmitting a response to said browser, wherein said response includes said new encrypted session token. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-10; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: new session token generated and transferred; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16; paragraph [0051], lines 14-16: encrypted session token information)

6. Claims **7, 8, 10, 20, 29, 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Williams-Wood-Lennon** and further in view of **Bachman et al.** (US Patent No. **5,907,621**).

With Regards to Claims 7, 19, 29, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 14, 23. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5 : time parameter usage and processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product) Williams does not specifically disclose a time out processing capability. However, Bachman discloses wherein including determining whether a session has timed out, said step of determining including determining an elapsed time between said timestamp and a current server time, and comparing said elapsed time with a predetermined maximum time to determine whether said session has timed out. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: session management; col. 4, lines 11-

17; col. 6, lines 10-19: process time out condition)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to process a time period expiration condition as taught by Bachman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bachman in order to enable the capability to create a secure communications session between server and client systems and avoid distracting the client with the placement of token information within the page. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: “ ... *An advantage of the present invention is that a secure user session can be established between an internet server and a browser at an unsecured client. ...*”; col. 2, lines 15-17: “ ... *To avoid distracting the user, the token is carried in a field of the page that is normally not displayed in the presentation space. ...*”)

With Regards to Claims 8, 20, 30, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 7, 19, 29. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: time parameter usage and processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product) Williams does not specifically disclose a time out processing capability. However Bachman discloses wherein includes closing said session if said session has timed out. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: session management; col. 4, lines 11-17; col. 6, lines 10-19: process time out condition, session erased, closed)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to process a time period expiration condition as taught by Bachman. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bachman in order to enable the capability to create a secure communications session between server and client systems and avoid distracting the client with the placement of token information within the page. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67; col. 2, lines 15-17)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

Art Unit: 2136

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2136

CVJ
August 18, 2008

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136